



## South Mountain Corridor Study Citizens Advisory Team Meeting Summary

**Date:** April 27, 2006  
**Time:** 5:30 p.m.  
**Location:** District 6 Komatke Center, Learning Center Meeting Hall

### CAT Members Attending:

Rock Argabright, Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce  
Laurel Arndt, Ahwatukee Foothills Village Planning Committee  
Kris Black, Ahwatukee Foothills HOA  
Steve Boschen, Valley Forward  
Jim Buster, Avondale  
Clayton Danzeisen, Maricopa County Farm Bureau  
Peggy Eastburn, Estrella Village Planning Committee  
Doris French, Laveen Village Planning Committee

Michael Goodman, Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council  
Don Jones, Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce  
David Lafferty, Tolleson  
Laurie Prendergast, Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development  
John D. Rodriguez, Lakewood HOA  
Jim Strogon, Kyrene de los Lagos Elementary School  
Dave Williams, Knight Transportation/AMTA

### Staff and Consultants:

Emily Bittner, PDG  
Matt Burdick, ADOT  
Mike Bruder, ADOT  
Kelly Cairo, GCI  
Chris Clary-Lemon, HDR  
Ken Davis, FHWA

Amy Edwards, HDR  
Theresa Gunn, GCI  
Bob Hazlett, MAG  
Don Herp, COP  
Heather Honsberger, HDR  
Dean Howard, PDG

Dan Lance, ADOT  
Ron Ober, PDG  
Roger Roy, MAG  
Ben Spargo, HDR  
Bill Vachon, FHWA

### Citizens:

Jim Creedon  
Nina Ehlers  
David Fitzhugh  
David Folts  
Randy Frank  
Adolfo Gamez  
George Good  
R.C. Hard  
Dennis Herndon

James LaSalvia  
Jerry Leavitt  
Matthew Alan Lord  
Glenda D. Massey  
James L. Massey  
Jim McCline  
Reyes Medrano  
Harry Mitchell  
Doug Murphy

Mary Odan  
Corinne Purtill  
William Ramsay  
Joy Rockwood  
Juan F. Rodriguez  
Dave Swisher  
Dan Tennesen  
Michael Vinson

### ACTION PLAN

Task/Activity	Who	When
Information to be sent to CAT includes: copy of the SMCAT letter to ADOT; draft meeting notes of the 4-27-06 SMCAT meeting; criteria importance graph; alternative matrix; alternative comparison chart; and, the CAT process evaluation form.	Amy Edwards, Theresa Gunn, Matt Burdick	

### Welcome

Theresa Gunn welcomed attendees and encouraged members of the public to review the Citizen Advisory Team handout. She explained that the purpose of the meeting was for

the CAT to evaluate the three west side alternatives and recommend a preference among these alternatives, should a freeway be built. The CAT will discuss the build/no-build option at a later date.

Matt Burdick thanked the group for their continuing participation. He reviewed recent city resolutions supporting the W55 option and opposing the W101 options, which were received from Buckeye, Litchfield Park, and Gila Bend. Other cities which previously passed similar resolutions include Avondale, Tolleson, and Phoenix.

### **SMCAT Discussion of Alternatives**

Gunn called for CAT member introductions. She explained that members requested open discussion time to discuss the alternatives.

#### ***CAT Member Discussion:***

**Comment:** I have the names of three people that I would recommend as health association representatives to discuss air toxins. **Response:** Please provide the contact information to Matt Burdick.

**Comment:** I feel the Tolleson numbers are low regarding lost tax revenue. A W101 alignment is a loss to Tolleson that is not recoverable. It would also split the community geographically.

**Comment:** The W55 option eliminates existing businesses, not just potential businesses as some of the other alignments do. Also, there is a serious homeland security issue with a freeway near the tank farm. This fuel issue affects the entire region. A cheaper option is not necessarily better. Also, I am concerned about adding load to the I-10 freeway when daily back-ups in the morning currently begin at 75<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

**Comment:** Laveen does not have a city government, since it is a village within Phoenix, and therefore cannot pass a resolution. A W55 alignment would split this community.

**Comment:** The City of Avondale recently took a position on this issue in support of W55.

**Comment:** The Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce supports the W55 connection option. (Don Jones read a statement from this group, which is included in these notes.)

**Comment:** The comments from those on the west side are similar to the comments made by those who oppose a Pecos alignment.

**Comment:** I would like to reiterate that we need a health care professional on this team.

**Comment:** I have attended 38 of the 39 CAT meeting. My impression of where the west side alignment should occur has changed. Land use planning has been poor, which leads to transportation issues. A freeway can't be used to solve a bad situation. I have underlying concerns with the MAG model. For example, a GRIC 11,000 acre development will radically change the future traffic counts, and information such as this is not included in the models. I am frustrated about the lack of information from MAG on truck traffic. I believe the greatest emphasis should be on protecting the communities that remain after a freeway has gone in. A W55 alignment is probably the worst for protecting

the remaining community members. If we agree on a W101 alignment, however, I hope we can qualify this message for ADOT.

**Comment:** I think a primary consideration should be purpose and need. Growth and consumption are also related. We don't currently have the infrastructure in Phoenix to support our current needs. I don't believe it is proper to cut through the community of Tolleson. There is also new development in the W71 area.

**Question:** Do you see 20 percent of your trucks on a new Loop 101? **Response:** (Dave Williams replied to this question.) There would be several uses for this freeway. The number of trucks driving through and not stopping is not significant. The Southwest Valley is a trucking and warehousing hot bed. A trucker will think like any other driver and go where there is no congestion.

**Comment:** The citizens of Laveen were abandoned by our councilmen long ago. I have a statement from a Laveen citizen, a list of signatures another person collected from Laveen residents opposing the W55 alignment, and a statement from the Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development. (Laurie Prendergast read these statements, which are included in these notes.) Also, I have asked many times for updates regarding the number of displaced employees on W55. I have also heard numerous announcements today that the GRIC governor hopes his community will reconsider a L202 freeway. I find the timing on this announcement suspect. I am also disappointed that there are not GRIC CAT members in attendance.

**Question:** Which area does Councilman Stanton represent? **Response:** (Prendergast responded to this question.) He represents Ahwatukee and other areas. He has stated that a South Mountain freeway does not make sense regionally.

**Question:** What is the position of the councilman for the Laveen area? **Response:** (Prendergast responded to this question.) He wants a W55 alignment.

**Comment:** I want to remind everyone that we still have the option to recommend no-build.

**Comment:** Tolleson is also concerned about noise and pollution issues. I grew up on public transportation and feel this state must move forward with this concept. There isn't enough concrete that could be laid in order to solve Phoenix's problem. There needs to be a way to prevent development that will obviously overload freeways.

**Comment:** Valley Forward has always supported light rail and other mass transportation options. The group supports a regional approach to issues.

**Comment:** The need for a freeway exists. I am concerned that a fight between W55 and W101 will result in selection of W71. W71 is not a good option, and we should not accept this as a compromise. If we look at the transportation flow alone, W55 does not work well. Trucks will take the shortest route. Cost per mile is part of this equation as well, and cost includes time.

**Comment:** I agree that public transportation is important, but it is difficult to change behaviors and takes time. We need to build this freeway.

**Comment:** An aging population tends to drive more, and not use public transportation or walk.

**Comment:** We do need concrete now.

**Comment:** How do we best deal with too many people, but not enough roads? One of the worst contributors to air quality is vehicles idling on congested freeways and streets. The flow of traffic makes most sense on W101.

**Comment:** In the four years since this group began meeting, Phoenix has grown by 750,000 people. We need some concrete, or the area will be a giant parking lot.

**Comment:** We need regional thought into connecting the freeway to arterials and in consideration of future transit.

The CAT members agreed that they were ready to proceed with the evaluation. Gunn noted the thoughtful nature of their discussion, and that it is clear why this is such a difficult decision.

She also thanked District 6 for their hospitality in providing an ongoing meeting site for the SMCAT, and acknowledged the catering staff members, who received a standing ovation for their efforts.

### ***CAT Member Questions and Comments:***

**Comment:** I would appreciate it if those in the audience who wish to talk would leave the room during the evaluation.

**Question:** There is not a GRIC representative here tonight. Does that mean there has been a group decision? **Response:** We are not aware of any over-riding decision.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

Gunn explained that the evaluation criteria had not changed from what was agreed to at the April 6 meeting. Throughout the evaluation, neither individual responses nor responses by number would be shown. She noted that the Co-Nexus process is a computer-aided comparison method and is a tool which the CAT could use to help make a decision on a recommendation.

CAT members activated and tested their keypads. They viewed the tabulation section, which showed that there were no votes entered into the system.

The dual-paired comparison portion of the evaluation compares each criterion to every other criterion once. The process allows the user to specify which criteria is most important and by how much. This information is then tabulated to weight the overall importance of each criterion for the group as a whole.

The CAT completed the evaluation portion of the process. The following criteria are listed in order of importance. There was consensus from the CAT that the list was representative of their beliefs as a group.

## ***Importance of Evaluation Criteria as Determined by CAT***

**1) Design and Operations:** Maximize operational efficiency and minimize congestion at freeway system interchanges and improve functionality of regional freeway and street systems. (OPERATIONS)

**2) Design Obsolescence:** The design provides for 2030 average daily traffic at a level of service D or better while providing for community access. (OBSOLETE)

**3) Quality of Life:** The freeway will not interfere with everyday life while allowing convenient accessibility to community facilities with minimal impact to residential areas. (QUALITY)

**4) Displacement:** Freeway alignment will disrupt or displace the minimum number of homes, businesses, schools, and parks. (DISPLACEMENT)

**5) Community Cohesion:** The selected alternative provides the necessary regional transportation capacity while providing the needed safe community connectivity at appropriate locations, and does not create a physical, psychological, or economic barrier. (COHESION)

**6) Air Quality:** The design and location of any new freeway built will maximize traffic flow and minimize the impact to regional air quality. (AIR)

**7) Noise:** Noise levels in proximity to the freeway should remain low and unobtrusive to normal everyday life and not exceed 64 dB. (NOISE)

**8) Project Cost:** Cost should be a consideration: total cost of constructing the freeway is assessed with the gains and losses to the affected communities. (COST)

**9) Ecological:** Does not disrupt wildlife habitat and connectivity, native vegetation, or natural water flow. (ECOLOGICAL)

**10) Alternative Modes/Multi-Modal:** The corridor provides for existing and future transit opportunities, park & ride facilities, and multi-use trails. (MULTIMODAL)

**11) Visual:** The freeway and its traffic is not visible from grade, any visible component of the concrete structure is mitigated through landscape and architectural design. (VISUAL)

## **Alternative Evaluation**

Gunn explained that the CAT would rate each of the three alternatives for each criterion. A 1-9 rating scale was used, with a rating of “9” the equivalent of “best.” Conversely, if the specified alternative would not accomplish the criterion shown, a low number should be assigned.

The W101 alignment scored highest in both the raw score for the alternative evaluation process and using weighted scores as determined during the criteria evaluation. The CAT indicated that this was not a surprising result.

## **Recommendation**

There was consensus that the CAT would like to make a recommendation to ADOT, and that the W101 would be the recommendation. All of the CAT members agreed that they were prepared to make a written group statement.

### ***CAT Member Questions and Comments:***

**Comment:** I think that these results represent us.

**Comment:** We should have a caveat on the 101 regarding the various options.

**Comment:** We can't recommend something when we don't know what it looks like.

**Comment:** W101 is a difficult recommendation because it is not a single route.

**Comment:** If W101 is also ADOT's preferred alternative, the CAT should have the opportunity to weigh in on the options.

**Question:** If ADOT chooses the W101 in June, would it be a specific option? **Response:** ADOT will choose a preferred alternative from the three west side alternatives. Should W101 be preferred, ADOT would not name a specific W101 option.

**Comment:** We need to say that the data shows W101 is our recommendation, but that we have concerns. We should list the concerns as well.

**Comment:** The analysis is valid, though I have concerns.

**Comment:** I do not disagree with this process.

There was consensus that the statement to ADOT represented the CAT, and all members signed this recommendation (please see attached document).

CAT members requested a copy of the letter and the charts that were shown during the Co-Nexus process. Gunn indicated that they would receive this information, as well as draft meeting notes.

Burdick said that CAT members would also receive an evaluation form regarding the CAT process. He explained that he would be the point of contact for the CAT during the transition to the new public involvement consultant.

## **Adjourn**

The next CAT meeting will be held to discuss the ADOT recommendation for a preferred west side alignment, which is anticipated in June. The meeting will be held prior to public announcement of the recommendation. The meeting date and location are to be determined.